Amendments to the Drawings:

Two replacement sheets are attached, having Figures 1 and 2 thereon. Figures 1 and 2 now contain the legend "Prior Art".

5   Acceptance of the drawings is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets   2 pages

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim objections:

Claim 10 is objected to because of the recitation of "n_{th} bit" in the last three lines of the claim, which should be corrected to read as "n^{th} bit". Appropriate

5   correction is required.

Response:

Claim 10 has been amended to correct this informality. Acceptance of the corrected claim 10 is respectfully requested.

10

2. Rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brusewitz et al. (US 6,038,257).

15   **Response:**

Claim 3 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now recites that the image-capturing apparatus comprises a register electrically connected to the analog front-end device for storing the digital image signal transformed by the

20   analog front-end device. The image-capturing apparatus also comprises an encoder electrically connected to the register for encoding the digital image signal stored in the register, and a decoder for decoding the encoded digital image signal encoded by the encoder. Furthermore, a processor is electrically connected to the decoder for determining whether the encoded digital image

25   signal encoded by the encoder is correct or not. Differing from the prior art, claim 1 also recites that the processor generates a control signal to control the encoder to re-encode the digital image signal stored in the register when the processor determines that the encoded digital image signal encoded by the encoder is not correct. This amendment to claim 1 is fully supported in the

30   specification of the instant application, such as in paragraphs [0031] and [0032],

and no new matter is added.

By having the processor command the encoder to re-encode the digital
image signal stored in the register instead of having the light sensor recreate

5   another analog image signal, a significant amount of time is saved since the
encoder can re-encode the digital image signal much faster than the light sensor
recreate another analog image signal.

In contrast, none of the prior art references teach the use of a register for

10   storing a digital image signal, an encoder for encoding the digital image signal
stored in the register, and a processor for generating a control signal to control
the encoder to re-encode the digital image signal stored in the register when the
processor determines that the encoded digital image signal encoded by the
encoder is not correct.

15

Lee (US 6,275,537) teaches in Figure 3 that a video encoder 30F codes the
digital video signal output from the buffer 30D and a coding controller 30H
provides control data to the video encoder 30F. However, Lee does not teach that
the coding controller 30H controls the video encoder 30F to re-encode the digital

20   video signal stored in the buffer 30D when the coding controller 30H determines
that the coded digital video signal is not correct.

Johansson (US 7,099,865) teaches in Figure 7 that configuring data is
downloaded again when a checksum mismatch occurs, but does not teach

25   re-encoding a digital image signal stored in the register, as is recited in the
currently amended claim 1.

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is
patentable and is not obvious in view of the cited prior art references.

30   Reconsideration of claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusewitz et al. (US 6,038,257) in view of Lee (US 6,275,537).

5

Response:

Claims 4 and 6 have been cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 5 is therefore respectfully requested.

10

4. Rejection of claims 2 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusewitz et al. (US 6,038,257) in view of Johansson et al. (US 7,099,865).

15

Response:

Claim 2 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration. Claims 7-14 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 7-14 is therefore respectfully requested.

20

5. Rejection of claims 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusewitz et al. (US 6,038,257) in view of Poo et al. (US 2003/0005337).

25

Response:

Claims 15 and 17-20 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 15 and 17-20 is therefore respectfully requested.

30

6. Rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusewitz et al. (US 6,038,257).

5 **Response:**

Claims 16 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 16 is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of
10 patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

15 _Winston Hsu_   Date: _____01/24/2008_____

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

20 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)